

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Examiner interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on September 7, 2006. During the interview, references in the previous Office Action were discussed. During the course of the interview, it was agreed that an amendment to make clear in the independent claims that the stack items of different length are packed contiguously would overcome the rejection of the Office Action mailed on June 16, 2006. Further, Applicant's representative and the Examiner agreed on an amendment to independent claims 12 and 19 to render these claims allowable over the cited references.

Claim objections

Claim 17 is presently objected to as failing to further limit its base claim. Claim 17 has been cancelled, rendering this objection moot.

Rejection of claims 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12-22 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Morris (U.S. 3,873,976) in view of Shibasaki et al (U.S. 4,334,269). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 12 and 19 are amended to point out that the stack items of different length are packed contiguously. The amendment incorporates the language agreed to during the course of the above-noted interview as rendering claims 12 and 19 allowable over the cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest operands of different lengths contiguously packed in a stack. As the examiner has

acknowledged in the recent Office Action and in the previous Office Action, Morris does not teach storing operands of different lengths in a stack having variable length elements.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Shibasaki fails to disclose or suggest a stack storing operands of different lengths in a contiguously packed arrangement. On the contrary, Shibasaki notes that “[a] stack comprises a plurality of elements, *the size of each element being a fixed word length.*” (Shibasaki; col. 1, lines 19-21) (emphasis added).

Therefore, Shibasaki cannot teach or suggest a stack having operands of differing lengths that are contiguously packed as a stack, and therefore Shibasaki cannot be used to modify Morris to reach the presently claimed invention.

Because claims 12 and 19 are allowable over the cited references, their dependent claims 13-18 and 20-22, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 12-22 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.


Application No.: 10/030,106
Examiner: Ryan Fiegle
Art Unit: 2183

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: September 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921